

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 – 9 and 11 - 15 are rejected. Claims 16-20 are withdrawn.

Claim 10 was withdrawn in Applicant's Preliminary Amendment dated 18 January 2005. Claims 16 – 20 were withdrawn on 10 July 2008 as a result of a Restriction Requirement.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b)

Claims 1 – 6 and 8 – 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Luo, et al., of record on 1449. (It is again noted that claim 10 was withdrawn on 18 January 2005.) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luo, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is common general knowledge that properties such as carrier conductivity of chemical compounds largely depend on their chemical structure and that even small structural differences can result in major differences. In this light, and based upon the following remarks, it is clear that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the end moieties are not mentioned in the claims of the present application. However, the end moieties are mentioned clearly in claim 1 of the present application. For example, claim 1 is defined with “end moieties which are different from the repeating unit; wherein the end moieties have hole conductivity, electron conductivity, or ion conductivity.” In addition, in claim 7 of the present application, specific examples of the end moieties are defined.

In contrast, Luo does not mention the end moieties having hole conductivity, electron conductivity, or ion conductivity. To the contrary, end moieties in Luo are only $-(CH_2)_4CH_3$. Importantly, $-(CH_2)_4CH_3$ is not the end moieties having hole conductivity, electron conductivity, or ion conductivity.

Furthermore, the wavy lines (~~~~) of compound 4 in scheme 1 of Luo is the equivalent to $-(CH_2)_4CH_3$. Considering the reaction of compound 2 with compound 3 in scheme 1 of Luo, it is clear to those skilled in the art that the wavy lines of compound 4 in scheme 1 of Luo equate to $-(CH_2)_4CH_3$.

Thus, as discussed above, the structure of a dendritic polymer of the present application is very different from the structure of the compound mentioned in Luo. Therefore, the rejections over Luo under both 35 U.S. C. §102 and §103 should be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-15 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-11 of copending Application No. 10/521,846. Applicant submits a terminal disclaimer herewith this response thereby obviating the rejection.

